

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2010

### GCE History 6HI02/C

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022887

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## GCE History 6HI02 Option C

There were some very good responses to this examination, with a sizeable number of candidates able to combine effective source handling skills with focused deployment of accurate and relevant own knowledge to achieve marks at level 3 and above. It was encouraging to see that many of the issues which had been identified in the summer report as posing problems for students were no longer causes for concern. However, there were still some common errors which undermined the quality of students' work and the purpose of the following comments is to offer some guidance for raising attainment.

1. Some candidates continue to lose marks because they seem unaware of the skills that specific elements of the exam are addressing. Overall 3 assessment objectives are being addressed in the Unit 2 exam; part (a) addresses AO2a (analysis, cross-referencing and evaluation of source material) and part (b) addresses AO1 and AO2b (analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context). It is vital, therefore, that students appreciate the differences between these assessment objectives and understand which of the 3 AO's is being tested in the two questions they are required to attempt.

2. The most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively. Occasionally, this was the result of limited vocabulary. However, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. It is important that candidates take time to read the sources, both content and attributions, carefully and precisely. One of the key characteristics of high performing responses to part (a) questions is detailed cross-referencing and this, first and foremost, demands clarity and accuracy in source comprehension.

3. One other area of confusion in the part (a) question surrounds the application of wider knowledge. Candidates cannot be rewarded for wider knowledge included in responses to part (a), since the questions target AO2 only. However, candidates should not ignore the historical context, or 'pretend they know nothing' outside the sources. At best, the placing of sources in a contextual vacuum may lead to a tendency to take them at face value and restrict responses to L1 or L2, or to speculation that is not focused on the defined enquiry. Therefore contextual awareness, especially an understanding of issues and attitudes, should be applied in order to help candidates:

- See the implications of statements within a source and make inferences relating to the enquiry –
- See the significance of the information given in the provenance of a source as a means of interpreting and evaluating the evidence offered by the source content. However, it should be emphasised that any references should be brief, and directly applied to developing arguments from the sources.

Contextual knowledge therefore plays a role in enabling candidates to interpret and evaluate evidence in order to reach higher levels, but it cannot be rewarded by separate marks. A brief reference may be useful in explaining the implications of a particular piece of evidence or the significance of its provenance and therefore support higher level arguments within AO2. Longer passages of contextual knowledge are a waste of time and may actually lead the candidate away from the task – which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources, in order to reach a judgement. However, candidates should not be discouraged from applying contextual awareness in handling the sources.

4. For part (b) questions it is important that candidates appreciate what they are being asked to do. A Part (b) task focuses on combining and integrating evidence from sources with wider knowledge in order to evaluate a given statement or view, and develop a substantiated judgement on this basis. It, therefore, draws on a conceptual understanding that all historical judgements are, in fact, based upon interpretations. Thus, candidates should analyse the evidence of the source material to support and challenge the representation in the question. The sources should be approached as a set and there will be some cross-referencing of evidence between sources and/or between sources and contextual knowledge to develop relevant arguments. At higher levels, conflicting arguments will be evaluated by reference to context and provenance to attempt to establish an overall judgement. However, it is important here that candidates do not engage in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation. Thus, in the best responses discussion will proceed on the basis of reasoning from the sources and discriminating use of evidence that has been weighed and contextualised to examine conflicting arguments and reach a reasoned conclusion.

5. Both part (a) and part (b) tasks are challenging, requiring candidates to engage in complex cross-referencing and analysis. To meet the assessment objectives effectively requires careful preparation and it is noticeable that more and more of the higher performing scripts include substantial plans. It cannot, therefore, be stressed enough that thorough and detailed planning centred around the source material is a prerequisite for success in this unit.

## Option C Conflict and Changes in 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Britain

### C1 The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, Boer and the First World War

Responses to part (a) almost invariably analysed and cross-referenced between the sources and, by so doing, were able to access Level 2 at the very least. There was some misinterpretation of Sources 1 and 2, with the phrases, 'We are not going to lose this war' (Source 1) and 'I do condemn war in theory most strongly' (Source 2), being erroneously taken as a reflection of the views of the authors. This does highlight the importance of close textual reading of source material. It is not uncommon for the content of one source to provide evidence both to support and challenge the contention in the question. The melodramatic tone of Source 3 did lead some candidates to question its authenticity, although it was pleasing to see that many still regarded the fact that a popular newspaper chose to publish it as a useful indicator of public attitudes. There was some good application of contextual awareness to reconcile the contrasting views presented by the sources, with, for example, many noting that Lansdowne's declaration was made in the immediate aftermath of the Passchendaele campaign (and a failed peace overture) while Brittain was writing before the major attritional battles.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following script demonstrates a Level 4 response, albeit a low one. A clear understanding of the three sources is displayed and the basic contrast between Lansdowne in Source 1 and Brittain and the 'Mother' in Sources 2 and 3 is highlighted. The fact that both the authors have suffered personal losses is cross-referenced and used, in the conclusion, to establish the weight that should be attached to the evidence. There is an attempt to reconcile the differences between the sources by deploying relevant contextual knowledge about the timing of the pieces. Although the response contains some weaknesses, for example opportunities for extended cross-referencing are undermined by a tendency to address the sources in sequence, the qualities of Level 4 are displayed sufficiently for a mark of 17 to be awarded.

(a) sources two and three both show some support for the continuance of the first world war, although source three is somewhat more in favour of the war than source two. All three sources are written after the feeling of widespread patriotism and support for war had peaked, so sources two and three do suggest that despite high casualty

rates there was still support for continuance of the war from the public.

By comparison, source one is much more against the continuance of war, believing that "its prolongation will spell ruin to the civilised world." Written by Lord Lansdowne, a former minister of Asquith's liberal government, it may have expressed such an opinion to gain public support from the increasing number of people experiencing the negatives of war and therefore turning against it. Another

(a) continued) Reason why its content may differ so greatly to both sources two and three is because it was written a year after them and also after the battle of the Somme ~~which~~ during which huge numbers of men were killed and a large number of those from Pal's battalions.

However, sources two and three both imply that the writer's ~~have~~ experienced personal losses due to the war. Source two, written ~~for~~ by

Verd Briltain in 1916 is said to have lost her fiancé to wounds a month before she wrote the letter. This could explain why she states "I condemn war in theory" however, she then implies the first world war is, in her view, "a war on all war" and therefore states her usual objections don't apply, showing support for the war despite losses.

source three is an anonymous letter that responds to another calling for

((a) continued) peace. The writer completely opposes peace stating "we women will tolerate no such cry a 'peace'" this letter was also distributed later to the public as a pamphlet, perhaps to try to gain public support for war. The writer implies much like source two, that she and women like her have born losses "uncomplaining" by offering their sons as "human ammunition." Both sources ~~one~~ two and three therefore give their support to the war despite high casualty rates.

Overall, sources two and three ~~give~~ support the claim that the British public supported the war despite high casualty rates. However, as source ~~three~~ one was written at a later date, it may reflect a change in public opinion at this time compared to the earlier accounts of sources two and three. In spite of this both sources two and three show support for the war despite

((a) continued) experiencing personal losses showing overall that high casualty rates had little impact on public opinion and overall, support for the war

For the part (b) question the majority of candidates opted for question 1b(i), with many displaying an impressive range of knowledge on the Crimean War and the work of Florence Nightingale. Virtually all candidates picked up on the debate contained within the sources and could analyse and draw out the implications of the material, but weaker candidates tended to follow this examination with a description of Nightingale's work which was, at best, only implicitly focused on the demands of the question. Better responses cross-referenced *The Times* report in Source 4 (allowing for the paper's motives in using such melodramatic prose) with the claims made by Trevor Royle in Source 5 to support the contention in the question through the deployment of their own knowledge. Source 6 could then be used as a platform to develop the counter-arguments, with the very best using Massie's distinction between the alleviation of hardship and the reduction of mortality when assessing the relative merits of the two sides of the debate.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following excerpt uses the sources to identify the core of the debate which is then developed with the deployment of relevant own knowledge. In the second paragraph, tone and contextual knowledge are used to explore the veracity of the representation of Nightingale contained in Source 4. What is important to note here is that this evaluation is directly related to and proceeds from an analysis of the claim made in the question, and is not simply appraisal for the sake of it.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) i. SOURCES ~~ONE~~ <sup>FOUR</sup> AND ~~TWO~~ <sup>FIVE</sup> both support the view that Florence Nightingale largely improved medical care for British soldiers. She was chosen by two powerful friends to travel with 38 nurses to the barracks hospital in Scutari. Upon arrival she is said to have improved sanitation, thus improving the conditions and reducing death by infection. However as source six states, the sanitary commission have also been accredited with improving sanitation through purifying the water supply. Although Florence Nightingale ~~is~~ was influential in improving medical care for British soldiers during the Crimean war, her biggest achievement was, as source five states, being able to "introduce reform" to the profession of nursing, especially as "through" the times" she

had access to the funds which would bring the necessities for improvement." In regards to the work she did in the Crimea, her successes must be shared

((b) continued) with the sanitary commission.

Florence Nightingale was given funds after the Crimean war to improve ~~in~~ nursing. These funds were raised by the public who recognised and celebrated her achievements in the Crimea. However, it is clear to see from source four, taken from "the Times" newspaper, that her efforts have possibly been exaggerated. She is described as "a ministering angel" whose "slender form glides quietly along each corridor." ~~Her~~ ~~the~~ dispatches such as this may have influenced public opinion and have obviously sensationalised her achievements.

Question 1b(ii) was the less popular of the options and only the very best could place the concentration camps in the wider context of British military strategy in the South African War. Weaker candidates tended to depend heavily on the sources and rely on assertion when arriving at a judgement. At this level, many responses focused exclusively on the 'barbarism' of the camps and any own knowledge was, for the most part, limited to descriptions of conditions inside the camps. Those operating at higher levels recognised the importance of the word 'deliberate' in the question and examined the claims in the sources in the light of the brutal struggle between British forces and Boer bitterenders during the conflict's guerrilla endgame. Thus, although many candidates remained unconvinced by the leisure facilities outlined by Andrew Roberts in Source 9, they were, nonetheless, able to reconcile his claim that the camps were simply 'a terrible unexpected by-product of guerrilla war' with the allegation of gross mismanagement contained in Source 7. The best responses demonstrated the ability to analyse the sources in depth and in context to establish conflicting arguments, and then draw on wider knowledge to develop and evaluate them to establish an overall judgement.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

The following response is operating at low level 4 for AO1 and low level 3 for AO2b. There is a clear focus on the representation in the question and relevant contextual knowledge is deployed effectively and integrated with the source material. However, there is a slight lack of balance, with the counter-argument mistaking neglect for intent, and the concluding judgement is rather too brief. Thus, an award of 19/24 is appropriate for AO1. For AO2b, although there is some attempt to reason from the evidence of the sources, the material is, for the most part, used to buttress the candidate's own knowledge rather than develop points to challenge or support the claim in the question. There is also some confusion over the attribution of Source 8 which significantly undermines its utility. However, selection is appropriate, there is a clear awareness of the representation under discussion and sufficient analysis of evidence in the light of this representation for an award of low level 3 to be made.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) ~~53~~ Critics of 2nd Boer war wrong to say concentration camps deliberate method of barbarism?

Source 14 is argued that the camps were not a deliberate method of barbarism but a place of protection + shelter for the Boers as a result of guerrilla warfare, the scorched earth policy + the ~~potens to~~ the potential to be caught in firing line. This is supported by Source 9, in which it says concentration camps were an 'unexpected

by-product of guerrilla warfare', 'it was not part of the deliberate use of the 'methods of barbarism'. Source Boers were also provided with necessities such as food, shelter + clothes. This is supported by source 9 in which it says they were given 'food, shelter, clothing'.

Authorities also let people in Britain raise funds for the Boers <sup>to get them provisions</sup> + distribute them among the concentration camps.

For example Emily Hobhouse set up set up the Discharge Fund for the Relief of South African <sup>children</sup> or food for the Boers and women + children. She also managed to secure soap for the Boers when she went to the

(b) continued) concentration camps. Britain also used the a search earth policy + guerrilla warfare in which they burned Boer farms + homes. The Boers therefore, as supported by source 9 had 'no alternative accommodation. After source 9 also states that 'Attendance was not the camp were voluntary. The government corroborated with this in reply to Emily Hobhouse reports, which was displayed in the Times.

Another reason why they critics were wrong to call the concentration camps a de 'part of the deliberate... methods

of barbarism" is that because as soon as ~~the gov~~ when the government was ~~also~~ alerted of the problems of the concentration camps e.g as it says in Source 7: 'the camps ... were grossly mismanaged ... Disease became rife' they set up a commission called the Llewellyn Commission to investigate the problems. ~~The gov~~ They were sent to Southern Africa to inspect the camps. Their findings showed that the conditions were extremely poor. They corroborated with

((b) continued) Emily Hobhouse's report that there was extreme overcrowding, provisions were not always being supplied for the Boers and they were dying from disease and starvation. ~~The gov~~ To demonstrate that ~~the gov~~ the government then suggested recommendations + implemented them such as more nurses, more supplies + entertainment for the Boers. This is supported by Source 9 in which it says 'in some' camps 'there were musical societies, reading rooms, games + sport'. This surely shows that the government's main aim was not to create "horror" or torture the Boers, but to protect them.

However, in ~~as~~ it could be argued that critics ~~was~~ were correct to say that the concentration camps were a deliberate part of the deliberate use of the "methods of barbarism". Emily Hobhouse would agree with this view. She had heard of the cruelty to the Boers in the concentration camps, so she became determined to help them ~~where~~. She went to visit the camps and there saw what

((b) continued) She called "methods of barbarism in South Africa". In Source 8, ~~to~~ which shows one of her speeches, ~~to~~ she said ~~the~~ world war ~~was~~ the Boer War, was no longer a war - it was just British barbarism. She produced a report of her findings in the camps stating that they were ~~over~~ grossly overcrowded ~~+~~ they were not ~~not~~ ~~in~~ ~~fact~~ ~~not~~ disease ridden. When she went there she spoke of how necessities were not being provided for the Boers and that when she asked for soap for them, members of the army laughed at her and ignored her. This suggests ~~that~~ that it was a game to the military & they didn't care about the welfare of the Boers. Furthermore

When Emily Hobhouse first produced her report to the authorities (they) (the government - they <sup>initially</sup> ignored her. They branded her a 'hysterical woman' who was being dramatic about the war. This suggests that the authorities did not care either about the Boers in the concentration camps either. Therefore ~~she~~ implying that the concentration camps were in fact

((b) continued) a deliberate method of barbarism.

It was only when the public pressured the government to investigate the camps that they did so and established the Paucett Commission.

Another reason ~~was~~ argument why critics & ~~we~~ could be right is that the camps were not completely voluntary, ~~and~~ despite the government stating they were. This is supported by Source 9 in which it says ~~sections of Boers were~~ "swept" Boers were "swept" and every person found taken to a concentration camp. Emily Hobhouse's report also showed that large numbers of children and women were forced into the camps.

§ One German would have seen the portrayed the camps as a deliberate method of barbarism. A German chancellor denounced Britain for what he called "inhumane method of barbarism". An illustration was also produced portraying Britain as devils sending innocent Boers to

((b) continued) to their deaths. However the Germans were bias as there were tensions between Germany + Britain

In conclusion I believe that these camps were not a deliberate method of barbarism, however, a determination to succeed in the war and safeguard their key strategic route to India. (not finished)

## C2 – Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage Question

C2(a) There were some very good responses to this question. This vast majority of candidates could develop the contrast between the report in *The Times* and the descriptions of Black Friday contained in sources 10 and 11. In addition, a sizeable number appreciated that there were also points of agreement; for example, 'lacked nothing in vigour' (Source 10) was seen to be supporting the 'relentless struggle' in Source 11. Candidates were clearly aware that the source attributions needed to be examined as part of the process of weighing up the evidence and arriving at a judgement, although, for some, this did not go beyond stereotypical assertions of bias. Better responses applied contextual understanding to develop the implications of the information contained in the sources. Thus, knowledge of *The Times'* hostile attitude to the women's movement was used by some to add weight to the admission that exceptional force was employed by the police. It should be emphasised, however, that this question does not require significant passages of 'own knowledge' but rather brief references to set the sources in context and assist in the process of drawing out links and implications.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following response is operating at the top of Level 13 (15/20). There is a good range of cross-referencing which offers detailed comparisons to draw out the similarities and differences between the sources. However, there is limited attention paid to the significance of the provenance of the sources. *The Times'* anti-suffrage stance is noted but not clearly developed to weigh up the evidence contained in the report. Similarly, the political stance of the Conciliation Committee is stated but not applied. The conclusion is used to re-emphasise the basic conflict between the sources rather than address the issue of 'how far'. Thus, the response falls short of the qualities required to reach a level 4 award.

(a) <sup>Both</sup> Sources 11 and 12 challenge the view inferred by Source 10, as Sources 11 and 12 present the idea that it was the police, of whose actions on Black Friday, of 1910 <sup>were</sup> ~~whose~~ provocative and heightened the presence of violence on the day. Moreover, Source 10 suggests that the actions of the suffragettes were instead, militant and <sup>violent</sup> ~~provoked~~ ~~be~~, and they <sup>in fact</sup> ~~themselves~~ 'flung' themselves against the lines of police.

Source 10, is an extract from an article written and reporting on the events of the 19<sup>th</sup> of November, 1910, later to be known as 'Black Friday'. The article, from *The Times* ~~title~~ supports the antagonistic view of this newspaper, along with many others published at the time, towards ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> allowing women

to gain access to the vote. This stance is evident in Source 9, which presents the view that the police 'kept their tempers very well', in contrast to the violence omitted by the ladies who 'plunged themselves against the lines of the police'. This contrasts to the stance taken by Source 11, which suggests that it was the ladies who were 'plunged hither and thither' amid the deputation of ~~suffragettes~~ <sup>members</sup> of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU). This Source is extracted from a memorandum by the Parliamentary Conciliation Committee for Women's Suffrage, of whom encouraged support for ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> enfranchisement of women - ~~but~~ seen through the attempt

((a) continued) to implement the First Conciliation Bill in June 1910.

The conduct of the police on Black Friday is noted in Source 11 as that of a violent nature, as the suffragettes were 'plunged' and violently handled outside Parliament. However, the 'relentless struggle' noted in Source 11, of which the police were engaged in can be found in Source 10 also, which notes that the police had 'their helmets knocked off' whilst carrying out their duty, in addition to one policeman having 'his head cut' in the struggle.

The 'method of shoving back the waiters' in Source 10 coincides with the method of throwing the suffragettes into <sup>the hands of</sup> an angry crowd, suggested in Source 11. This conduct <sup>form of violent</sup> taken by the police in Source 11 supports that of Source 12, extracted from a statement by a suffragette involved in the demonstration on Black Friday. The 'brute force' of the police is mentioned in this Source, which contrasts to the suggested violence of the suffragettes in Source 10.

The suffragette had encountered a most violent conduct by the police

on Black Friday of 1910, suffering a 'terrible blow' to the back, alongside one policeman, <sup>who had</sup> twisted who had 'twisted' her right arm behind her back. This method of utmost violence, obstructed by the police supports the course of action witnessed in Source 11, of which the police had been instructed to avoid 'making any arrests'. The first-hand account of Source 12, from a participating and active suffragette provides support for Source 11, both presenting the view that the conduct of the police was that of a violent <sup>course</sup> choice of action.

In conclusion, the stance taken by Source 10 opposes

((a) continued) the views of Sources 11 and 12, as it infers the idea that the <sup>calm</sup> conduct of the police was met with a violent and militant approach taken by the suffragettes. It highlights the <sup>peak of the</sup> militancy campaign taken by members of the WSPU, during the years 1908-12. However, Source 11 and 12 imply that the the conduct of the police on Black Friday was that of a militant and brutal nature.

There was an even split between the two options for the part(b) questions. Most of the candidates in 2b(i) were able to analyse and draw out the implications of the sources and could follow this up with some relevant own knowledge focusing, more often than not, on the role of Butler. Some contextual understanding of the 'double-standards' referred to in Source 15 was shown by nearly all candidates but, for many, this was simply a device to assert the importance of Butler rather than evaluate her role. Better responses displayed a clear understanding of the scope of the women's movement in this period and the sensibilities of Victorian polite society and could site the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts firmly in this context. Most responses used Source 14 to present the counter-argument but, again, only the best could effectively develop the issues with wider knowledge. The very best recognised the subjective nature of Sources 13 and 15 and balanced Butler's role as a figurehead against the nationwide scope of the campaign to arrive at a considered judgement.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following response is an example of a very strong script; it was awarded good level 4 for both assessment objectives. The candidate starts with Source 13 in support of the contention and makes clear the fact that this is an interpretation that is being dealt with by stressing that the evidence is 'presenting' a representation of Butler. Relevant and accurate contextual knowledge about the mores of Victorian society is then deployed to emphasise the degree of opposition the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts faced. Further support is provided by cross-referencing with source 15, although close textual reading enables the candidate to employ the source as a platform for the counter-argument as well. Again the analysis is focused and developed through cross-referencing and careful deployment of accurate and relevant contextual knowledge. There is a sophisticated reference to Source 14, with the evidence being used not simply to buttress an existing argument but to develop it further. This is by no means a perfect answer, the judgement is rather brief and lacks reference to the source material, but it is conceptually very sound and displays all the qualities required for a level 4 award in both Assessment Objectives. It is worth noting that the candidate clearly spent some time on planning.

(i) Source 13 totally agrees with the statement that Josephine Butler was primarily responsible for the repeal of the Contagious Disease Act. She had to 'fight this fight' for 'womanhood'. This implies it was a great war that had to be fought for women everywhere. She Butler is presented as strong and courageous. She is 'Christian' adding a moral purpose to her fight. Yet, she faced 'tremendous opposition'. This would be not only from the police who she was criticising for the dehumanising treatment of prostitutes nor the government for allowing the act to place the blame on prostitutes, but also from the public. In the 1860s, when Butler was campaigning,

women simply didn't speak out. They were supposed to be meek and mild, the 'angel in the house' who's totally dedicated to her husband. Butler is far away from her female sphere of the home and domestic and is entering the public, male sphere of politics. She also faced opposition as she was talking about a very taboo subject. Not only sex but prostitutes and sexually transmitted diseases and the double standard that comes with it (men being free to have many sexual partners whilst women stay chaste and ~~being~~ <sup>prostitutes</sup> being blamed for the spread of STDs when it was men who used the services). In 'the beginning', there was 'no organisation' to support her. The NUWSS was founded in 1897 and the WSPU in 1903 so the two main organisations were not around to help Butler to campaign. However, there was the National

((b) continued) Union for Women's Suffrage which was founded by Lydia Becker in 1867. However, although Lydia Becker supported her, not everyone did. A controversial topic like this led to divisions with the NUWS which seriously weakened the early suffrage movement. This shows that she did not wholly have the support of ~~the~~ an organisation like source 13 suggests.

Source 15 partially agrees that Butler was responsible for the repeal but also implies that it wasn't just her. It claims she made 'huge social and legal reforms'. Although it is true that Butler got the Contagious Disease Act repealed in 1886, it is questionable as to ~~is~~ how far she made social reforms.

After all, after the 1918 Representation of the People Act when women over 30 got the vote, Emmeline Pankhurst was still campaigning for the eradication of the double standard. The source implies that she was very important but also that

She led a campaign to repeal the Act. Therefore, she may have been a great figurehead but she had help from other sources. Source 14 agrees saying there were 'regional campaigns'. The campaigns being referred to were led by the Ladies Association, a group of upper and middle class women. It was run not just by Butler ~~was~~ but by Lydia Becker too. Therefore, Butler relied on these women to spread the message and let their voices be heard. Unlike source 13, it implies that there was support for Butler among the public as shown by these women. Due to the fact it was ~~a~~ such a taboo subject, it shows how committed these women were to the cause as they spoke

(b) continued) out against it. The campaigns the women did like petitioning, writing leaflets was revolutionary as they'd had hardly any and other women's campaigns to follow. They helped Butler to show the injustice of the act and highlight the problem.

Butley in source 14 takes it a step further saying that it was also MPs that helped. For example, J.S. Mill in 1969 tried to make an amendment to the Reform Act. This was a landmark in women's suffrage as the parliamentary support helped raise awareness tremendously. It is clear, that if ~~you~~ women did not have parliamentary support, Parliament simply wouldn't repeal the act.

In conclusion, Butler was very important in repealing the act but she wasn't primarily the reason. The work of the Ladies National Association, Lydia Becker and sympathetic MPs were equally important in raising awareness and support. Butler may have been the driving force behind it but the others helped with the work.

2b(ii) Nearly all candidates could utilise the sources as a starting point for the arguments for and against the contention. Most recognised the importance of new technologies in providing a range of employment opportunities for women, with clerks offices and the Post Office featuring regularly. Although the reference to 'routine office chores' in Source 17 was picked up by many candidates, only a minority used this as a platform to explore, in any meaningful way, the all important distinction between opportunity and status. Those that did could generally site the expansion in female employment in its cultural context, and used the evidence of the sources and their own knowledge to examine the extent to which the separate spheres ideology was transferred to the workplace, both in terms of space and function. Weaker responses tended to take the sources sequentially and at face value. Thus, the significance of John's (Source 16) reference to the 'piano' was missed as was the link between Davies' (Source 17) observation about threatened male status and the attitude displayed by the Postmaster General in Source 18. Higher performing candidates appreciated these nuances and integrated them with wider contextual knowledge to arrive at a judgement focused explicitly on both opportunity and status.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following extract highlights a number of the qualities expected of a level 4 response. The opening paragraph firmly establishes the focus of the piece by highlighting the distinction between 'opportunities' and 'status'. This is then illustrated through careful selection from the sources supported by the deployment of relevant contextual knowledge. Thus, Source 17 is used as a platform to develop the contention that new technology did result in increased opportunities and support is provided through cross-referencing with Source 16 and contextual knowledge of female employment in clerking offices and the Post Office. Close reading of the same two sources, however, also leads to the establishment of an argument challenging the contention in the question, with brief contextual support (which is developed later in the piece) about the persistence of traditional gender ideologies. From the outset, this candidate has set up a tightly focused analysis in which issues, identified in the source material, are explored through the integration of relevant historical knowledge and the evidence of the sources.

((b) continued) During the years 1860-1914 the introduction of new technology was undoubtedly important for creating a niche in the workplace for women to fulfill. However this does not mean that their status was greatly changed. <sup>Thus</sup> ~~These~~ new technology was still an example of women's nurturing, helping side as seen in the Victorian idea of 'Angel in the house'. This said other factors were in place around this time which undoubtedly improved both status and opportunity.

far more. This is a topic which has many different views about it, as shown in the similarities and differences in the sources.

On one hand this new technology did offer improved <sup>opportunities</sup> ~~techno~~ as shown in source 17, 'they eased the entry of women into offices'. This shows that as these <sup>new</sup> technologies were seen as a suitable and respectable employment for women, <sup>making</sup> it was easier to find work in such jobs. This is supported by the fact that in 1881 there were only 6000 female office clerks. In 1901, following twenty years where the <sup>use</sup> use of the typewriter, <sup>which</sup> <sup>had</sup> <sup>become</sup> <sup>most</sup> <sup>keenly</sup> felt in the 1880's, <sup>and</sup> this number <sup>rose</sup> <sup>to</sup> 60000.

((b) continued) Similarly source 16 agrees with this idea shown in source 17. For example, 'a range of clerical work... created unprecedented new opportunities.' This <sup>implies</sup> ~~infers~~ that <sup>women undertaking</sup> the clerical work was ~~not opposed to~~ by the men. This suggests that without this work women would have been unable to get onto the working ladder. It <sup>also</sup> ~~is~~ implied that the clerical work opened the door for women into the work place. This is supported further by the fact that in 1914 the Post office had become the largest single employer of middle class women, 90% of women working for the government were employed by the post office.

Thus said, this quote also infers that ~~the~~ women undertaking 'the clerical work' were not being opposed by men. This shows that the clerical position was still very much below that of any man as the men did not feel threatened enough to oppose it. Source 17 states it was 'routine chores' this certainly does not show an improvement in status for women, it merely shows a continuation of their current role but in <sup>an</sup> office rather than at home.

**6HI02 C Statistics**

## Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	36.6	8.2

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		17.2	36.6	61.4	77.6	89.5



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US022887 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

